

# Transcript

January 20, 2026, 7:56AM



**Brett Hyland** 4:58

It's just got one minute past the hour, so let's let's make a start. I'll load the Rules of the Road slide. So, we have a mixture in our group of registered CFACT experts versus observers. They have slightly different roles, but all are welcome to participate in in this meeting. You register as an expert through your own country's delegation and the link is through the UNCFAC website. This is also an open development process, as are all of UNCFAC projects. What this means is that the process is transparent and the outputs of our work are made available free of charge, free of royalties and part of this is that all of our own collective contributions as volunteers are gifted to the UN, which is why they can be made available without charge and without any obligations to proprietary interests. If you do not want to share your intellectual property in this way, then it's better for you to keep that property to yourselves. You can see there are some other policies and codes which you're free to look up at your leisure, and lastly we ask that no unauthorised AI note takers are involved so that we can control an official version of the meeting record. So thank you for your attention to these matters.

The first item on our agenda is any new joiners to this group and I can already see that we have some today, so that's wonderful. I might just ask each person who's not attended one of these meetings in the past to say hello and to name your affiliation. So you might be a conformity assessment body, you may be a regulator. Let's have an understanding of which perspective you're bringing to this group. So if we could start with Dr Huang, please.



**Dr. Easter Huang IPC** 8:19

Hello, hello everybody. My name is Easter Huang and now I'm working for IAS as a verifier and validator program technological chair and working for IPC too, IPC is the International Personnel Certification who is recognized by IAF as the auditors scheme owner and they have a new standard for the verifier and validator. It's a very nice honor to have opportunity join this team. Thank you. I'm located in Taiwan, in Taiwan.



**Brett Hyland** 9:09

Thank you, Doctor Huang. Now I can see Yakut Oktay has joined us. Would you be able to introduce yourself briefly, please?



**Yakut Oktay** 9:23

Thank you, Brett. Hi everyone. My name is Yakut and I work for the Responsible Business Alliance and we, I think we are considered a scheme owner in this context. Lovely to meet you.



**Brett Hyland** 9:35

Thank you very much. Now, are there any other participants today that have not introduced themselves to our group before, please?



**MP** **Martina Paul** 9:47

I've written some emails but not I did not participate yet, Yes. so thank, thank you very much for the opportunity. I'm joining here in in in particularly because I am member of diverse ISO CASCO groups, so the Technical Interface Group and the Chair of the Policy Advisory Group. This is one point and the other is I'm a member of the IEC Conformity Assessment Board. So, what I'm representing here is basically the ISO and IEC world. My major interest, as a disclaimer, is with the view of ISO IEC JTC 5 which is currently under foundation on digital product passports, to support the alignment of these two worlds, UNECE/UNCEFACT and ISO/IEC as much as possible. And that's it, so I'm a conformity assessment conformity assessment expert.



**Brett Hyland** 11:06

Yes. And I think we we share your goals. Let's see how well we may may achieve those. So with introductions now out of the way, Steve Capell isn't here, perhaps we'll just, we'll just leave that for the moment and move to what may turn out to be the major agenda item today and that is the preparation of the assessment assurance material, in anticipation of the public review phase of UNTP. Now our group was given a deadline of mid-January for this work, aligning with the expected public comment time frame. So today we are, ready with a draft for potential approval. And of course, I need to acknowledge the contributions of many to this work, quite a few

of whom are on this call today. But as usual, I want to especially mention Reinaldo and Gideon who have delivered much of the technical expertise that has gone into this work. Before we open up the document for discussion, I want us to keep in mind that what we're trying to do is move forwards tonight with technical content. Now there's a there's a comms team that will advise us on readability and we know that every section on the UNTP website will need some kind of non-expert level instruction and that applies to us as to everyone else. But I don't want that, in itself, to stand in the way of moving the technical content forward. Another thing is that there will be the need to put some IT architecture. I don't know if that's the right phrase, but to bring the technical content into a structured data system. And again, we're not at that point yet today. So we are only trying to move forward with the conformity assessment technical content. Now I do want to provide a just a very brief context for those that may not have worked been working closely on this from the inception. It does actually stem from work that was published in July 2024 by UNCEFACT, called the Digital Product Conformity Certificate Exchange Business Requirements Specification. That's 18 months old now and there are people on this call today that that worked on that project. But what we're involved with in this latest phase is the UNTP-specific implementation of that work, which has its own defined logical model for the conformity credential. This logical model for the conformity credential includes quite a few data fields that capture assessment criteria, so the standards or regulation against which a facility or a product is assessed. However, there are three additional data fields within this logical model that are at a high level and which deal with the type of assessment approach. One of these three additional fields is fairly obvious and that's the attestation type, which tells us whether we're dealing with a certification, or testing, inspection, verification or validation. Then there's another data field called assessor level which points to independence, so the question of are they a first, second or third party assessment organization, again, reasonably straightforward. And lastly, there's the assessment level data field, which is exactly what we've been defining in the work under discussion today. This deals with the nature of the credibility that is backing or endorsing the conformity assessment process. So that's the context. Anyway, you will have seen the draft that we're going to discuss tonight, I'll also put that up on the screen now. And with that, I shall open the floor for discussion, please.

can lead out Brett. So I've had a pretty detailed review of it today and was starting to spend time thinking about the next phase of this. So you described it as dressing up the technical document with the technology components and I think that will really come out as we test this against schemes that are already actively piloting UNTP, many of who are actually on the call tonight as well. So, I'm really looking forward to trialing this with several folks here on the call and seeing how this looks in real life instead of just the theoretical or descriptive framework that we have here. So I think this gives us a great start and I think the next as we go into versions 0.7 and 1.0 we'll have plenty of time to try it out over the next couple of months.



**Brett Hyland** 17:06

So Zach refers there to 0.7 and 1.0. These are future versions of the UNTP specification, with 1.0 being the production mode, is that the right terminology, Zach?



**Zach (Pyx)** 17:21

Yeah. So, so basically when we get to 1.0, what we're trying to indicate to the marketplace is that it's ready for production usage. It is ready for production use now, but when you're in this 0.7 evolution phase, things are still changing a little bit and so there's potentially some rework coming in front of you as you adopt in this phase. And just so everybody's aware, we are targeting 1.0 for June of this year.



**Brett Hyland** 17:58

Zac, can I ask if we're still on track for a late January public review commencement? I'm guessing that's possibly slipped by a week or two?



**Zach (Pyx)** 18:09

I do know that each of the groups are working hard towards it and I haven't heard any formal discussion on slippage yet, but I think you're probably realistic in your in sort of terms of expectation setting. But it's not going to push much past the end of January.



**Brett Hyland** 18:35

So I have been incorporating technical comment all through this process to date and as far as I'm concerned, any technical comment that I've received has now been

reflected in the document. But of course there may be other issues that that you're burning to tell us, so are there any other thoughts or perspectives that that you feel we need to consider at this stage?

**AZ** **Adrienna Zsakay** 19:11

I'm just wanting to know, is this the text that you're going to put on the website or the documents? Is this going to be a downloadable document? How is this going to be presented?

 **Brett Hyland** 19:34

So I would say this is the basis of text for part of the relevant page. I'll we will need to work with the Comms group to make sure that they're satisfied that we're communicating this properly, but really what I'm hoping to get support for today is that the technical approach from a conformity assessment perspective is viable and and expressed in a way that conformity experts at least at this stage can understand it.

**AZ** **Adrienna Zsakay** 20:14

OK. I yeah, I I know that part. we've discussed that by e-mail earlier. I was just wondering whether this was the pretty well the final version of what you want to put onto the web.

 **Brett Hyland** 20:27

Well, not really, Adriana, because as Zach pointed out, it's not this paper, or whatever we should call it, is not structured in the same way as the other UNTP pages. So it needs at least to be restructured according to headings like overview, conceptual approach, logical model, you know the standard headings for each UNTP page. Our document does not look like that at the moment, but we want to put it into that format without butchering the technical approach of course.

**AZ** **Adrienna Zsakay** 21:00

Right. Unless of course you want to consider changing the rest of the website to fit this.

 **Brett Hyland** 21:07

It's just a reflection that those that those of us that worked on this document only really know conformity assessment, so that's all we worried about, we sort of worked in a bubble but we'll leave it to others to guide us into how it should be presented, I think.

 **Zach (Pyx)** 21:43

Well, we need to provide guidance to technical implementers because this is intended to be a normative page. So we want to provide guidance to implementers that when you're implementing the protocol and want to provide assurance about an assessment process. Here are the things you should or must do. And so we need to give that precise guidance so that the technical implementations of this maintains interoperability and is consumable across industries as this are being leveraged around the world. So that that's the work that we're looking to as the next step once the technical requirements are agreed, putting it into the normative framework that the rest of the UNTP specification is in.

 **Brett Hyland** 22:53

Thanks, Zach. Neil's got his hand up.

 **Neil Savery** 22:56

Thanks, Brett. Mindful this this conversation, as you said, is about the technical content, not the cosmetics of it. I just thought it might be useful for the others online, but I circulated this document to the International Accreditation Service who obviously had no prior exposure to this document and they had not come back and suggested that there is a need for any further technical change to the document. So that suggests to me that a somewhat impartial, but nonetheless expert, pair of eyes have looked over this and said they can make sense of it. They have passed on a number of comments which I've provided to Brett, which go to the point about using some plain language to explain what this is, how it works, the sort of stuff Brett said will get will happen as part of the packaging, but to the point about is it technically sufficient? I would say based on that feedback from IAS that it is.

 **Brett Hyland** 24:07

Thank you Neil, and for those of you who may not be aware, this document was circulated in an earlier in an earlier version to 400 scheme owners around the world. Feedback from that process has been incorporated into the version that we're looking at now. In any case, I'm always mindful that at any of these meetings we are only a subset of the of the wider Conformity group but, nonetheless, you are the ones that have taken the trouble to log into the meeting today. So I now ask you, as a subset of the main group, if you are happy for us to proceed with this as the basis for the technical content for the UNTP page, which will be worked on by others to convert it into a consistent format with the rest of the UNTP Specification.

 **Neil Savery** 25:22  
I am Brett.

 **Zach (Pyx)** 25:26  
We've seen some thumbs ups from several other people as well.

 **Andrew Wheeler** 25:30  
Yeah, I'm good with that, Brett.

 **Martina Paul** 25:37  
Martina here, yes, me too.

 **Andrew Wheeler** 25:53  
I'm good with that. I think it's it's a good start. I think as Zach said, it's the devil's gonna be the detail once we start. So putting it in place and picking up the various things that we've missed or which might be interpreted differently. So yeah, it's good to go, I think.

 **Brett Hyland** 26:18  
Yeah, all right. Well, I can see we've had pretty clear endorsement from this subset of the group. So, so thank you all very much for that support and of course a double thanks to those of you that contributed to the document either directly or through circulating the work amongst your network. Ok, let's move now to the next agenda item, if we may, which is the question of how UNTP can reference externally published standards in a consistent way. To reiterate, we have a scheme vocabulary

process defined in UNTP for schemes to define their internal criteria and in a uniquely referenceable manner. That's their own criteria, but if schemes call up external standards, as many of them will, we don't want them all calling up the same standard in a different manner. So that's an easy concept I think to articulate but as we've discussed in recent times, this is actually quite a challenge to codify. So in the other document that I circulated late last week, I've tried to express the state of play on this. I wouldn't say that we've made enormous progress, but we've probably made progress in the sense that we've identified quite a few issues that need sorting out. I'm very far in my own mind of feeling that we've that we're at the point of a workable solution, but maybe some of you have had an opportunity to think about this since our last meeting and maybe bring some bright ideas to the table. Often with these complex issues, it sometimes it turns out that an intractable problem was only one or two bright ideas away from a solution. That may turn out to be overly optimistic in this case, but let's open the floor for discussion, while I put up the other document. There we are, so hopefully you you've seen this document.

 **David McNeil** 29:49

Thanks, Brett. Look, you can rely on me for a dumb question. When we talk about standards here, are we talking about conformity standards or are we talking about product standards and or is it just a generic term around standards?

And yeah, so because I think if it's a conformity standard versus a product standard, there's probably a few nuances that we might have to consider.

 **Brett Hyland** 30:22

Well, it's all of the above. It's anything that a scheme might want to reference. So they might want to reference a specification, a paper from a journal, a product standard, a conformity assessment method. This is, I think, what makes it such a challenge for us.

 **David McNeil** 30:50

I'm just thinking about from a product standard point of view, it is. Thank you.

 **Brett Hyland** 30:58

Of course, if this, if this does get too hard, and it may, we can retreat to a lesser

position where we, you know, we can define something a little less ambitious, but which may still prove useful. Martina, I see your hand.

**MP** **Martina Paul** 31:23

To be generic and flexible is important because it adjusts to the marketplace and to what we're doing and we're evolving. So at the same time, my question is how do we ensure interoperability or in particular comparability? Because if we are having now 20, let's say at the end of the day 20 different schemes in place which are referencing 20 different 100 different standards from various origins etcetera, how can they become, how would you think and sorry for maybe this question is now naive because we have already discussed about it. How would we compare the results of these conformity assessment schemes? Or is this not a goal?

**Brett Hyland** 32:18

*[edit: first part of reply removed deleted as I realised in editing that I misunderstood Martina's question]*

And if two different schemes are calling up the same standard, we at least want to know digitally that they're talking about the same thing. That's the goal. I mean, it's not an easy goal. Phil has his hand up, and I'm hoping he's got some, um, enlightenment for us.

**PA** **Phil Archer** 32:37

No, I'm sorry. I want to say that as we've as you're highlighting Brett, different standards organisations publish different things. They internally reference things differently. So I think the list you've got slightly further down your page is they always have a title. they always have who published it. Then you want to have a Uri if you possibly can. The only thing you haven't included as I'm looking at the UNTP standard fields is that some organizations include the names of the authors and, for those that do that, that's really important. So I know from my work and other standards bodies that the way you encourage people to become editors is the fact that those people get their names written on it in academic circles. It can count towards your academic impact as well, which is a really big carrot for people. So I do think that for standards bodies that that include the names of the authors then I think the authorship is important. But you always know what the thing's called, you always know who issued it, and you usually have some idea of a publication date. But

you're not going to get consistency across all of them because not everyone publishes those things. So just live with it. That's all you can do.



**Brett Hyland** 34:17

I've just stopped sharing for the moment, I think we recognise this is a difficult task. We probably are starting to recognise that the structure that is predefined in UNTP, that is just four elements is probably not adequate for our goal. We may also be coming to a realisation that there will be no such schema that will allow every scheme owner to confidently express a link to a standard that would be mirrored exactly by any other scheme owner that's mirroring that same standard. And so it's it's beginning to feel to me like we're going to have to scale back our expectations. We don't want to abandon this goal altogether, because to help users, whether they're customs officials, end consumers or industrial buyers, to make useful judgments about competing product passports with links to all the conformity credentials and the standards to which those conformity assessments are being done, we want to enable comparability otherwise we've lost something of value from the original vision. So I'll put that idea in your mind that if we are going to retreat slightly from our original ambition, where is somewhere where we can make a line where we can actually generate a useful schema? Or do we end up saying, it's has to be down to AI because it's just too hard to codify?



**Neil Savery** 36:17

My comment might sound very flippant, but it probably goes to the point about possibly retreating somewhat from the ambition and looking and listening to the comments just leading up to your pause. It strikes me that the T in in the acronym of UNTP is the key here, it's about Transparency, to be able to capture a certain amount of information that allows for people to make informed decisions or at least be able to understand or access the documents that are being relied upon. I don't know if traceability necessarily comes into it, but I think the focus has to be capturing sufficient information, not necessarily to the extent that two different schemes using the same standards may actually be referring to them in a slightly different way, which creates unnecessary duplication and extra work, but that the person who is receiving the documents or looking at the documents can access sufficient information that makes it transparent as to what documentation is being relied upon. And that's the essence of the UNTP. So I suppose I'm kind of moving away from

some sort of schema, some sophisticated schema that is requiring scheme owners or the authors of journals, Standards, whatever they happen to be, to do so in a particular manner that can easily be captured by the schema, but rather there's an obligation to capture a certain amount of information as you've attempted to sort of initiate Brett. In the second page of your document, capturing a certain amount of information about the documents that are being relied upon. Thanks.



**Brett Hyland** 38:21

Well that's that's nice to hear in one way Neil and I do agree that you've captured the essence of UNTP and that maybe some of these bells and whistles in trying to provide that extra level of digital verifiability may turn out to be a stretch.



**Zach (Pyx)** 38:46

Yeah, I'm going to sort of echo, but provide kind of a slightly different perspective I think, which is I think we do need to kind of retreat on the on what is the initial sort of requirements of this schema, but I don't think we should retreat on the vision or the potential of having well-structured information, because I think we should be able to articulate "Here's what best practice looks like, and if you're writing something, you might want to follow this because it helps". The consumers of this standard or specification use it more easily and so I think we should kind of articulate what we think might be the idealized practice, while making sure that we're very flexible to accept the reality of all of the different ways in which documents are stored and shared and published today. And so that we kind of can be flexible in the short term and enable the world as it exists now, but also show a pathway to something that might work more effectively. And if it does work more effectively, then value will be realized and people will start demanding that more effective documentation pathway. If it's not more effective, then the specification itself will die and we won't have wanted to have spent too much time on it.



**Martina Paul** 40:23

I was just reading as a chat about what Reinaldo was raising and in particular about test methods and specification terminology. But this would then be considered a real standard itself if we're talking about terminology. You see I'm still thinking about comparability, as I mentioned earlier. So if we're looking at the verifiable credentials as a method to look at this, this makes it of course, this makes it interoperable. So if

we put that in the center, I think that this could be a major cornerstone for interoperability and comparability. At the same time, my question is not yet answered even though the framework is generic. But it is open and therefore I was agreeing to put it to the public because I think it's important that we are leaving our bubble and get more input in it because if you're looking at different standards and different data and what you have just shown are basically metadata, but there will be a variety and I presume from all this European work which is going on, there will be a variety of additional data there. So what I understood now, I think it was Zach, that it's about transparency. So this would be the next cornerstone. So we have the verifiable credentials, we have transparency. So the major part is that there are data fields available which can be compared but the other question, which is a sort of traceability because, a data field itself doesn't say anything about how the data have been generated. And this is a little bit against the case for AI because AI depends on very good quality data. So, Traceability is open for me, comparability is still a little bit open for me. But it is in the Data, the Transparency and in a Verifiable Credential, in these three cornerstones I would find it. Thank you.

 **David McNeil** 43:05

My comment would be is we don't retreat from the goal, but we acknowledge that in achieving the goal we're going to go through a few cycles on getting it right. It's essentially trying to come up with a scheme so that when someone is saying I'm checking against this standard then someone else can actually verify that, yes, that's the standard you're verifying against and at that level, that's all this is intending to do. The next steps follow on from that as part of UNTP. So I think there's probably enough there to sort of get started and to start populating with examples. And then we'll find, we'll start to find a limit, we can make an advancement. So where you've got ID, there's probably going to be an ID number and maybe an ID scheme so that people can check the uniqueness and things like that. But I think that that's enough to start working on I think in actually populating the real examples to make it work.

 **Brett Hyland** 44:27

Yes, you are quite right. I mean, this isn't holding back the progress of UNTP. It can move forward regardless. It's just that this was a 'nice to have' idea. And Martina has raised some interesting questions there. For now, I suggest rather than banging our head against this particular brick wall for consecutive meetings that we pause and

reflect, then one of us is going to have a good idea. It mightn't solve everything but someone will come up with a good idea and at that point we'll bring this back to the table. In the meantime then, let me introduce something else, a little bit out of left field.

For those of you who have been with this group from the start, of course we've only been going since July in this current form, it's sort of been a continual process of unexpected things landing on our laps. When we first uh started this work we were told that we had to look after the scheme vocabulary page. I'd like to think that we rose to the occasion with that one and we rewrote the the scheme vocab page and then there was the assessment assurance work that that popped up in October, from contributions from people like Martina and others saying that assessment assurance is a critical part of this work for it to be robust. Again I think we've shown that we were able to rise to that occasion as well. But now there's something new that's popped up fairly recently and we won't be able to do much work on it today of course, but I wanted to introduce the concept because that'll give me an excuse to circulate some material ahead of the next meeting so we can get our teeth into it. Anyway, this is a concept called the digital identity anchor, which is has been assigned to the conformity group, you can discover it yourself on the UNTP website if you like. But it's in essence a way for one party to confer some sort of recognition on another party. And because our assurance work, that we've just signed off on, does heavily involve authorities, whether they be governments, or a UN intergovernmental agency, or global accreditation cooperation signatory bodies, these are all authorities relevant to our work and so we will need a way to confirm all these authoritative linkages. And there is already a logical model that's been developed by UNTP for these recognitions to be awarded in a transparent and cryptographically verifiable manner. So we might shift pace and try our hand at the digital identity anchor concept at the next meeting. Was there anything, Zach, that you wanted to provide that might be a little bit more illuminating to the group than what I've been able to say?

**Z** Zach (Pyx) 48:25

Yeah, there's probably a couple of things to add to that. So the idea of a digital identity anchor was that its this root of trust for well-known identifier schemes in regional economies. So business number, personal identifiers, things which are often publicly available, but you it's hard to validate easily in practice. So the original idea

is that if I issue an invoice or some other business document and I'm able to attach my business number to it and that business number comes from a well-known authority like a tax office or a federal business registrar, then a user can be more confident in the veracity of that invoice or digital product passport that I receive from the person who's issuing that document. So that was the idea of digital identity anchors originally. Now as we've been discussing and working through projects and scenarios, another place that is kind of an identity anchor more in the conformity space is in accreditation bodies. So the accreditation body and how do we provide trust to the accredited certification body? Do we want to use the digital identity anchor because it has that kind of model, or do we want to create something new that's? That's one of the items that we're exploring. The other thing just to add about sort of the digital identity anchor component of UNTP is it actually has spun out an additional project called the UNCEFACT Global Registry Global Registrar Information Directory (GRID) project. It's a project that's working with a number of different global registrars. So, like national land title registries, national business registries, and building that idea of a trust anchor structure. It's moved outside of UNTP because it does have broader trade and trade facilitation implications. Now from a digital identity anchor component the work that that Brett's foreshadowing here, we're going to be looking at how we use both GRID as well as the definition in UNTP to make sure that we're meeting all of the requirements of the UNTP specification and intent. I I don't know if that makes things clearer or not.



**Brett Hyland** 51:30

Thanks Zach, hopefully we're slowly absorbing the ideas and there's one further application that has relevance to our group. We've been discussing for months now the assessment assurance work, but it's not just the conformity assessment assurance, but there also exist assurances over schemes and sometimes those are directly issued by governments, so I would imagine that we will see a role for the digital identity anchor in providing a pre prerequisite scheme assurance linked to the scheme representation rather than the conformity credential. So I look forward to unpacking that that work with you all, through our meetings and through exchange of correspondence between meetings. Now Steve didn't arrive and the last agenda item was the UNIDO item. I can't offer much on that, but I saw correspondence from Steve raising the possibility of whether they would consider taking on a global role in recognizing benchmark benchmarking organizations according to the principles of

their benchmarking organisation document. I haven't seen anything further and Steve's not here to enlighten us

**NS** **Neil Savery** 53:29

Brett, just getting back to the digital identity anchor stuff, if there is any material you can circulate prior to the next meeting, because I must say I struggled with the description you and Zach have just given, particularly in terms of its application? What's its purpose? Why is it relevant? That would be helpful, but I'm not asking you to go and write something. If there's something already there that you can circulate, that might be helpful.

 **Brett Hyland** 54:00

Thanks Neil. I'll do that. I'll do that promptly after this meeting.

**MP** **Martina Paul** 54:20

A very quick one just as an improvement and hopefully not to complicate. Could be interesting to look into what is going on in regions in terms of digital identifiers, digital wallets, business wallets, because in some regions like in Europe it will be a prerequisite for the product passport and the second building block which is connected to it are the data spaces. So for UNTP, UNCEFACT, whatever we do here will be connected to these two concepts. However, regardless of whatever standards there will be, the overall concept which presents to my mind as I'm seeing it all evolving is digital identity, business wallets, registries, or anchors however you want to call it, and data spaces. Thank you.

 **Brett Hyland** 55:22

Yeah. So thank you. I might ask Zach for a comment on that because I think I think there is some understanding that those concepts will need to reconcile. But for anyone who's wondering, I want to make clear that UNTP will not be issuing digital identities, so I hope that at least is clear. We'll be leveraging existing credible identities. So let's say a government wants to say that this scheme is mandated, they can provide some recognition that anchors the identity of that scheme owner to their own credible government identity. An accreditation body can do something similar for accredited facilities by anchoring the identity of a laboratory or a certification

body to their own credible identity as a government authority. So Zach Wallets and Data Spaces. Any thoughts?

**Z Zach (Pyx)** 56:21

I'll start with the data spaces because that's a little bit more developed. We have been actively working with Catena X, which is one of the data spaces implementers in the automobile sector. We have architected interoperability model with them and the action rests on them to evaluate that, so we're working through that. And then the second thing in terms of wallets, which are the idea of verifiable presentation of information, and the ability to hold your encryption keys so that you can verifiably present information. UNTP is an interoperability protocol, and the credentials themselves are independent of wallets, because there's no supply chain requirement. I mean a business may have a wallet, but a box moving between businesses, like a consignment of goods, is not necessarily going to have a wallet. And so the UNTP interoperability protocol is how you move the data in a consistent standards-based way between entities. And then the question is how do you trust the information you're receiving? And that's where the digital identity anchor comes in. So, if the credential that is being passed from business A has been signed by an organization that has been that has linked their signing credentials to their recognised government-issued identifier, then that's the mechanism that is defined in the digital identity anchor space. Then people can trust that the credential hasn't been tampered with and they can receive that information effectively. So wallets are another way of doing that. We've kind of abstracted away from that, from a UNTP perspective, because we don't want to pick a wallet provider, a wallet solution or a wallet infrastructure to support this. We've identified a way of working without it.

**FR Figueiredo, Reinaldo** 59:02

Is all good points, but the point that are creating a lot of problems to all the stakeholders that support conformed assessment and government entities is malicious information and misleading information about records, certificates and other chain of confirmed assessment results. This is something that I think this work is going to help to decrease, but I think UNTP needs to think more about this because this is a huge problem. The large CBs have structure just to identify organizations that are using their marks and documents. This is just growing,

growing, so that to all conform to assessment structure, I mean, accreditation bodies, CBS, government needs to be looking and how to solve this. Thank you.

**Z** **Zach (Pyx)** 1:00:24

Yeah there is quite a lot of work that has been done here. While we have divided the groups into the conformity group, the supply chain group, the technical group and so on, allowing us to focus on individual topics, I do think sometimes we lose some of the other context from some of these things and so it may be worthwhile, Brett, to bring some of the security architecture and the verifiability or trust architecture components to this group. To articulate how those things have been designed into the protocol and potentially we bring that into the discussion. Especially in regard to the identity anchor because it's one of the key components that makes this work so that you guys can start looking at the identity anchor component and we can make sure that we're confident in its robustness.

 **Brett Hyland** 1:01:35

Thank you, Zach. You said it better than me. I was going to make the point that malicious actors have been one of the one of the main targets of our wider work. Although we don't speak much about it here, because we talk about conformity assessment, it has been a major plank of other aspects of the wider protocol. So I think we should take the opportunity to bring those concepts across and we will be actively involved ourselves as we work through the digital identity anchor stuff. Anyway, we did in the end fill our whole hour. It's been a very wide-ranging discussion and I hope that you've enjoyed yourselves today and we look forward to seeing you on the next occasion. Thank you all and goodbye for now.